

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-104 are now pending in the application. While the Applicants disagree with the current rejections, the Applicants have amended the claims in the interest of expediting prosecution. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue the claims as originally filed in one or more continuing applications. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for courtesy extended during the interview on October 5, 2006. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that, as amended, the claims distinguish over the prior art of record subject to further consideration and/or search.

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Burnstein (U.S. Pat. No. 6,268,716). Claims 1-104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Varga (U.S. Pat. No. 6,144,194). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, neither Burnstein nor Varga show, teach or suggest a digital controller that is adapted to selectively set the phase interval to one of greater than  $360/N$  or less than  $360/N$ .

An illustrative example in paragraphs [0026] and [0028] and FIGs. 4A-4C shows two output phases having a duty cycle of 33% and a phase interval of about 150 degrees. As best understood by the Applicants, both Burnstein and Varga set a phase

interval dependant on the number of output phases. In other words, Burnstein and Varga would automatically use 50% duty cycle and 180 degrees. (See Varga, Abstract and Burnstein, Column 15, Lines 37-40.)

Therefore, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 9, 22, 30, 43, 51, 62, 68, 76, 82, 90, and 96 are allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Claims 2-8, 10-21, 23-29, 31-42, 44-50, 52-61, 63-67, 69-75, 77-81, 83-89, 91-95, and 97-104 ultimately depend from claims 1, 9, 22, 30, 43, 51, 62, 68, 76, 82, 90, and 96 and are allowable for at least similar reasons.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 18, 2006

By:   
Michael D. Wiggins  
Reg. No. 34,754

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDW/mp